U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

CASTLE QUEST 01-06

Initial Themes

21 Oct 2005

Initial Themes From MANSCEN Surveys

Emerging Themes Survey #1

- ENCOM is an Army asset that reports to a joint commander in a JIM environment.

- Senior Engineer with oversight of theater master planning, synchronizes, coordinates and prioritizes work requirements.

- Must be able to seamlessly and securely integrate efforts with JIM organizations.

- Non-military agencies may drive requirements.

- Requirement to tap HN expertise on infrastructure.

- No clear consensus on when or if ENCOM assumes theater EN C2.

- Need legal/statutory/regulatory job description for EEC

Emerging Themes Survey #1 (cont)

- FEST Team requirements:
  - Some form of self-defense
  - Tele-engineering kits
  - Vehicles
  - Comms (secure and non-secure)
  - ARRK (automated route recon kit)
  - Force protection provided by supported unit
  - Laager in a secure area, but close to operations
  - 50/50 on who controls their movement (ENCOM and Maneuver Cdr)

Emerging Themes Survey #2

- Base-camp requirements will be established ICW JIM agencies
- USACE supports (rather than leads) explosive hazard (UXO/IED/Minefield/indirect) identification and clearing mission.
- Need for a contracted surge capability contracted in the event of near simultaneous catastrophic incidents. May be with sister Services.

Initial Themes From Open Session

Initiative 23- Establish Theater Engineer element and the processes needed to plan, train and deploy in support of an ASCC.

- Command and Support relationships require greater clarity:
  - ENCOM Cdr relationship to JTF HQ and other engineer organizations; OPCON, TACON, ADCON
- Need to clarify roles and responsibilities of Staff Engineer, ENCOM, and FEST-M (grounded in doctrine but METT-TC driven)
- What is threshold/condition set when ENCOM Cdr assumes theater engineer responsibility?
- How are IA and multinational engineer requirements identified and prioritized?
  - And how do we better leverage joint, interagency and multinational capabilities?
- Who is responsible for RSOI – what headquarters or unit?
- Who is responsible for theater-level base-camp master planning?
  - Must be viewed in a joint and interagency context
- Who is responsible for base-camp management?
- Need greater flexibility with OMA, MILCON and other funding sources
- Should we consider prepositioning selected USACE capabilities?
- Important to have ENCOM capabilities bridge transitions…
- Mature idea of a standing engineer contract to address a broad range of contingencies
- ENCOM must have representation on early joint and interagency planning

Initiative 24 – Institutionalize and improve the responsiveness and readiness of civilian capabilities in support the ASCC

- Training across USACE, common individual and collective training standards across the Divisions.
- Developing habitual “training” relationships with TOE organizations to leverage their facilities.
- Should we link USACE readiness and training to ARFORGEN cycle?
- Readiness Reporting System capable of plugging into existing readiness systems.
  - Must address USACE TDA capability, as well as, TOE capability
- Adequate funding to support training of USACE teams.
- Capacity at Winchester, Virginia to deploy large numbers of USACE teams?
- Challenge of paying reimbursable employees while on contingency missions

Initiative 24 – Institutionalize and improve the responsiveness and readiness of civilian capabilities in support the Emergency Essential/Non-combat Personnel Status Issues

- Statutory and legislative constraints
- Compensation
- Training standards
- Medical/Physical Fitness requirements
- Security clearances
- Equipping issues
- Funding in support of contingency operations

All adjunct to Readiness 21 Initiative

Other Considerations

- Initiatives 23 and 24 should be re-drafted to reflect greater "jointness:"
  - Initiative 23- Establish Theater Engineer element and the processes needed to plan, train and deploy in support of an ***ASCC***.
  - Initiative 24 – Institutionalize and improve the responsiveness and readiness of civilian capabilities in support the ***ASCC***.
- Roles and responsibilities of ENCOMs should be carefully reviewed (troop to task analysis) - future force concept gives them considerable responsibility.
- May be worth briefing the future force concept to other IA entities and Cbt Cdrs to develop buy-in and support.
- Important to weave this concept into Service and joint concept development and experimentation programs.
- Lack of Engineer presence on SJTF staffs
- Greatest concerns at this point:
  - Funding to support training.
  - Institutionalizing the USACE workforce into a more complete expeditionary package.
  - Integration of USACE into ENCOM training and capabilities

Administrative Comments

- What did we not cover in the discussion that you believe important to the issues at hand?
- What changes would you make in the next exercise to better address these important issues for the future?
- What broad ideas do you have to better respond to the underlying imperatives in Initiatives 23 and 24?
- Were the facilities (including food, room setup, audio, etc) and the facilitators conducive for exercise participation?

Web site for Castle Quest information and Documents

http://www.hq.usace.army.mil/cerd/

Then click on the Castle Quest Logo.

Way Ahead

- 1 November GOSC (changed to 17/18 Nov)
- 14 November MANSCEN Analysis
- 17/18 November GOSC
- NLT 1 December PDT formed
- 16 December CQ 01-06 Technical Report
- January ’06 FDU Jr
- Spring ’06 CQ 02-06
- May ’06 UQ 06
- Aug/Sep ’06 CQ 03-06